



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/575,547

05/14/2007

Romilly Blackburn

127721

8954

25944

7590

03/04/2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

P.O. BOX 320850

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER

WOO, KUO-KONG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/04/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/575,547	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BLACKBURN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> KUO WOO	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 May 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on 6/7/2006 has been considered.

### ***Priority***

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1- 8, 14-22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Heiner (US Patent No: 6,112,227) in view of Stern et al. (US Patent No: 7,340,048 B2).

Regarding claim 1 and 15, "a method for delivering messages by a sender to recipient over a communication network, receiving a message from the sender" Heiner discloses (Col. 2 Lines 1-3, receiving an original electronic mail message from a source client at a destination server);

Art Unit: 2617

“Sending an automatic verification request to the sender requesting a verification response” (Lines 3-8, sending a reply electronic mail message from the destination server to the source client requesting that the source client complete a registration process; monitoring the response of the source client to the request to complete a registration process to determine whether the source client properly responds to the request);

“Receiving the verification response from the sender and delivering the SMS message to the recipient upon receiving the verification response” (Lines 8-11, and sending the original electronic mail message from the destination server to the destination client only if the source client properly responds to the request to complete a registration process), wherein registration process is verification process for the source client (sender). However, Heiner does not explicitly teach “delivering the SMS message”.

In an analogous art, Stern discloses (Col.2 Lines 40-42, It is to be understood that the invention has many embodiments and can be applied to any system where confidential and secure access to an entity or services are needed), and (Lines 53-59, To place a call or provide access to the subscriber, the invention associates a subscriber with a cellular phone number by context association. The subscriber manages context associations on the web, by telephone, short message (SMS), or any other means to access the listing creation mechanism, with conventions that are established 333 by each subscriber), wherein the application is applied to SMS and message application on the web).

Art Unit: 2617

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Heiner teaching in combination of Stern provides any system where confidential and secure access to an entity or services are needed (see Abstract)). Rationales for arriving at a conclusion of obviousness suggested by the Supreme Court's decision in KSR include: Combine prior art elements according to known method to yield predictable result.

Regarding claims 2 and 16, "sender identification and verifying the SMS message includes comparing the one or more sender lists and verification request is send to the sender where the sender is not in the white list" Heiner discloses (Col. 2 Lines 17-24, comparing the electronic mail address of the source client to an accept list of electronic mail addresses; sending the original electronic mail message to the destination client when the electronic mail address of the source client is on the accept list; sending a reply electronic mail message from the destination server to the source client requesting that the source client complete a registration process when the electronic mail address of the source client is not on the accept list) wherein request the source client (sender) to complete registration process (verification) on the accept list (white list) for sender's identification.

Regarding claims 3 and 17, "wherein the sender identification is mobile telephone number" Heiner discloses (Col 4 Lines 3-9, in other embodiments, the registration process is completed by filling out an Internet web page form or by following instructions via a telephone system. Although these embodiments have particular benefit, those skilled in the art will appreciate that there are many different ways in

Art Unit: 2617

which the registration process can be performed, wherein those skill in the art is able to request sender mobile telephone number as to prove as the sender identification.

Regarding claim 4 and 18, "wherein the sender identification is an email address" Heiner discloses (Col.2 Lines17-20, comparing the electronic mail address of the source client to an accept list of electronic mail addresses; sending the original electronic mail message to the destination client when the electronic mail address of the source client is on the accept list ), wherein registration process ( verify the send identification) is checking the source (sender) email address.

Regarding claims 5, 14, 19 and 27, "wherein the one or more sender lists includes a black list, and the white list includes a list of authorized a senders and the black list includes a list of unauthorized senders" Heiner discloses (Col. 3 Lines 29-32, the reject list may contain e-mail addresses of known sources of junk e-mail and any e-mail address from which the destination client wishes not to accept e-mail.), wherein reject list is black list.

Regarding claims 6 and 20, "wherein the on e or more senders lists includes super white list, and the SMS message is delivered to the recipient when the sender identification is included on a super white list" Heiner discloses (Col. 4 Lines 19-21, If the e-mail address is properly registered, the original e-mail message is sent to the destination client and the source client's e-mail address is added to the accept list, as indicated in step 150), wherein super white list along with message send to destination client (recipient).

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding claims 7 and 21, Heiner teaches the message is received by a mobile telephone. However, Heiner does not explicitly disclose “wherein delivering the SMS message to the recipient includes allowing display of SMS message on the mobile telephone.

In an analogous art, Stern discloses (Col. 2 Lines 49-53, In one aspect of the invention, a cellular phone subscriber's web-managed context association such as, but not limited to, an alpha numeric string, is used as a unique address to locate and provide information, access, or both to a calling subscriber. To place a call or provide access to the subscriber, the invention associates a subscriber with a cellular phone number by context association. The subscriber manages context associations on the web, by telephone, short message(SMS), or any other means to access the listing creation mechanism, with conventions that are established 333 by each subscriber), wherein SMS message can be displayed on the mobile phone as each subscriber as requested.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Heiner teaching in combination of Stern provides illustration of the feature of the invention as needed( see Abstract). Rationales for arriving at a conclusion of obviousness suggested by the Supreme Court's decision in KSR include Combine prior art elements according to known method to yield predictable result.

Regarding claims 8 and 22, “wherein the SMS message is received by a system server to the mobile telephone” Heiner discloses (Col. 2 Lines 1-4, receiving an original

Art Unit: 2617

electronic mail message from a source client at a destination server) and (Lines 8-10, sending the original electronic mail message from the destination server to the destination client), wherein original message from source is sending through server to destination (receiver mobile phone).

5. Claims 9-13 and 23 -26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Heiner (US Patent No: 6,112,227) in view of Lewis et al. (US Patent No: 7,454,195 B2).

Claims 9 and 23, Heiner teaches white list and system server for verification of sender identification. However, Heiner does not explicitly disclose “wherein the super list is synchronized with a second white list over the communications network, wherein the second super white list is stored on as system server database”.

In an analogous art, Lewis discloses (Col.3 Lines 35-45, an alias email routing portion for storing alias email routing information, a sub email portion for storing email information, an email type portion for storing email type information, a browser portion for storing browser information, a sub service attribute portion for storing sub service attribute information, a blacklist portion for storing blacklist information, and a white list portion for storing white list information. The storage device further includes a device portion for storing device information associated with the wireless subscriber), and (Col. 7 Lines 28-37, the one or more routing entities are known as a Routing and Validation Entities (RAVE) 130 which may be accessed by the ARCs 110a-c to perform validation, routing and alias/distribution list functions. The RAVE 130 accesses routing information



Art Unit: 2617

in a Routing and Validation Database (RVDB) 135 via a Backbone Integration Transport Bus (BITBUS) 132. The RAVE 130 accesses alias and distribution list data in the User Alias Database (UADB) 140.) and ( Lines 60-62, Also, a Subscriber Configuration interface (SCI) 165 interfaces to the network transport bus 125 for allowing users to access and update subscriber and messaging device information.), wherein server database is updated through RAVE ( verification process) which include list or with, black and other list information which is synchronized ( Updated) the list.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Heiner teaching in combination of Lewis provides and storing subscriber information in a centralized location includes a processor, memory coupled to the processor, and a data storage device coupled to the processor ( see Abstract). Rationales for arriving at a conclusion of obviousness suggested by the Supreme Court's decision in KSR include: Combine prior art elements according to known method to yield predictable result.

Regarding claim 10, Heiner teaches white list and system server for verification of sender identification. However, Heiner does not explicitly disclose "wherein the white list is synchronized with second white list which is stored on a system server database".

In an analogous art, Lewis discloses (Col. 36 Lines 9-22. MTA 2420 may perform validating functions using data stored in UADB 2460. UADB 2460 is a replicated database which contains a complete set or a subset of data contained in, for example, the MIND database (shown in FIG. 1). In this example, UADB 2460, which is a replicated database, provides customized message handling information on a per

Art Unit: 2617

subscriber basis. UADB 2460 may contain, for example, customer aliases, White lists, Blacklists, distribution lists, language filters, message formatting options, and other aspects of a subscriber's profile. Subscribers may be able to update their profile via an Internet portal, through the subscriber configuration API, or through other means. Consistent with the technology, UADB 2460 may receive updates from other network databases), wherein subscriber white list and other databases communication link through (Mail Transfer Gateway) MTG (system server) and ( Mail transfer Agent) MTA and store in UADB ( User Alias Database) and UADB update ( synchronize) the database with subscriber list ( white list) and other network database.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Heiner teaching in combination of Lewis provides and storing subscriber information in a centralized location includes a processor, memory coupled to the processor, and a data storage device coupled to the processor ( see Abstract). Rationales for arriving at a conclusion of obviousness suggested by the Supreme Court's decision in KSR include: Combine prior art elements according to known method to yield predictable result.

Regarding claims 11, 13 and 26 have limitations similar to those treated in the above claim 10 rejection(s), and are met by the references as discussed above.

Regarding claims 12, 24 and 25, "wherein the one or more sender lists are stored on a mobile telephone SIM card" Lewis discloses (Col.19 Lines 18-20, a wireless subscriber may be allotted a certain limited amount of storage in a message data store

Art Unit: 2617

such as MDS 150a), wherein MDS (Message Data Store) is function as storage device to store sender list for each subscriber (user).

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US Patent No: 6199,102 B1 to Cobb al discloses a similar invention as recite in claim 11
- US Patent No: 7,272,852 B3 to Goodman et al discloses a similar invention as recite in claim 12.
- US Patent No: 6,101,393 to Alperovich et al discloses a similar invention as recite in claim 9.
- US Patent No: 6,023,723 to McCormick et al. discloses a similar invention as recite in claim 9.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KUO WOO whose telephone number is (571)270-7266. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/KUO WOO/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Lester Kincaid/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617